

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55738 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-11030 Year-2023 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

Vineet Kumar S/o Vinod Kumar Singh, Proprietor M/S Global IT Zone, 302
(1-3) Chandi Vyapar Bhawan, Exhibition Road, P.S- Gandhi Maidan, Distt.-
Patna (Bihar)-800001. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Dharendra Jha S/o Late S.D. Jha, R/o Chand Pur Bela, P.S- Kankarbagh,
Dist.- Patna (Bihar), Being The Manager of M/S Uniworld Vision Pvt. Ltd.
... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sujit Kumar, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP.
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Raj Saurabh Nath, Advocate.
	:	Mr. Manjrai Nath, Advocate.
	:	Mrs. Shalini Sinha, Advocate.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 25-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the Opposite Party
No.2.

2. The petitioner apprehend his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case No.11030(C) of 2023 instituted under
Sections 323, 406, 420, 504, and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the complaint case, the complainant is a
distributor of the C.C.T.V. and the petitioner is a shopkeeper to
whom the C.C.T.V. items have been provided. The allegation
against the petitioner is that he has not paid dues amount of
Rs.10,88,480.98/- despite the acceptance of same.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that the dispute relates to business transaction and the dispute is of civil nature, therefore, Section 420 of I.P.C. is not applicable against the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that the complainant is a litigant person and he is always putting pressure in different ways against whom the petitioner has stopped business with him. He further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he undertakes to cooperate in the trial of the case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that petitioner has taken contradictory stand that he has signed on the document accepting the dues amount but he has dishonest intention from the initial stage to not make the payment of the dues amount to the complainant.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, in the event of arrest or surrender before the Court below within six weeks from today, the petitioner be released on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount to each to the satisfaction of the



learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-IX, Patna in connection with Complaint Case No.11030 (C) of 2023, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

Ritik/-Siwani/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

